

M2032

Thursday, July 17, 1971
Philadelphia
Group III

Mr. Nyland: So now, tonight, we'll have to talk about Gurdjieff. I listened to the tape in which a few of you gave a little background of yourself and I know, perhaps, by this time some of the voices. Otherwise it's entirely new to me. A few people I know. I know also a little bit of what you are thinking and in what direction you know, perhaps, something about Gurdjieff or the ideas—or Ouspensky, Nicoll and some of the others.

How will we do it. If you have questions, we can start with questions if you like. If on the other hand you would like a little explanation about Work, then we can do it that way. It's all up to you, really. I think these kind of Groups should be more and more a discussion; and particularly, of course, if you actually are interested in Work you have to talk about your Work attempts, what you have done, what you have accomplished and where you run into trouble.

I think you know enough about what we really want to talk about, in essence. It has to do with inner life, development of inner life. Not outer life; that quite sufficiently develops because we can get along in the world. By outer life I mean the reactions of oneself towards other people or towards conditions, everything that is outside of oneself. Inner life obviously is one's own inner life, and the question is then to develop such inner life if it is important for one.

If it is not important, I would not consider you serious. I think that each person who really looks at life and comes to certain conclusions that at a certain point there is a little bit of an end or that it becomes repetitious, that then he starts to look for something else, provided he is still interested in life itself. If he isn't, then he makes adjustments to whatever the conditions are and he keeps on living and taking care of himself as well as he can perhaps until he dies. But, we are talking about possible development of a Man in a certain direction, and that direction we call simply 'evolution' because it has to do with a changing of levels of where a person is, trying to

grow up to a different level by certain means, and the levels would indicate levels of development and also might indicate levels of Being.

And the question that really comes up, then one asks "what for," and in order to answer that you must know what you are. Because if you are satisfied with what you are now, you would not be interested in any kind of a change. And it ought to be very clear that we don't talk about changes in ordinary life, and we really don't care very much about the further so-called 'development' of your brain or your feeling. That is 'so-called' development. That is the addition of different parts of certain knowledge which will enable you to make life on Earth perhaps a little easier, or that you become more clever, or that you have deeper feeling and you become more artistic. I don't really want to talk about that very much because that's ordinary psychology, and it is not in our domain and it was definitely not meant by Gurdjieff.

I also would like to make it clear that we talk—in Warwick and the Barn and the different, Groups that are now spread over the rest of the country—we talk Gurdjieff. We don't talk Ouspensky, we don't talk Nicoll, we don't talk anyone, for that matter, except Gurdjieff. Because after all, he was the person who started that and the others were pupils who, to some extent, understood what was what and perhaps in other ways did not, and perhaps even interpreted too much.

I would like to stay completely free from interpretation. I would like to make sure that what we talk about—and that I hope you will talk about because I will not be here, quite logically, every time—it's only to 'help' you, as it were, to start a Group. The idea of a Group, for me, is that you actually get together to talk about your Work. Not to talk about ideas. You can do that and you have a little feeling and it is interesting for your mind, but it is not interesting enough for your Being. The development of a Man is not dependent on how clever he is, is not dependent how marvelously essential and even in the sense of being artistic, but it has to do, quite definitely, with his inner life and his religion. When one talks about that without any particular prejudice, you have to understand that by inner life is really meant the possible development of a Man in a different direction from where he is now living on Earth and that he, as it were, wants to 'get away' from Earth the same way as when he dies, he will definitely get away. If he continues to live depends on a great deal of different kind of circumstances and conditions, and it is not just to be assumed that he will continue to live. There is life in a Man, but we don't know if that life can exist without the body, and without going too much in detail

about reincarnation and recurrence and such problems, I think it is logical to assume that if I work for my life or work for my inner life, that then I'm entitled to continue with it—at least for some time.

Now, I don't know what really brings you together. I don't know what your particular questions could be. Also, I don't know how serious you are. I don't even know, of course, what you understand of Work. I do know a little bit about your interests, and maybe it is better that you ask questions now, and then I will try to answer them. So, whoever wishes ... and don't ... don't leave pauses because it's no use, we have no time.

Yeah.

Questioner: Um, if we have been used to working from a book like In Search of the Miraculous or identifying with that sort of thing, what kind of work could we do from Gurdjieff's, uh, book.

Mr. Nyland: It all depends on what you have been doing as far as Work is concerned. Could you explain that, maybe?

Questioner: Well, I've been in groups, and generally that was the book used and it was, um ... in other words 'inner considering' and all of these things that Ouspensky had explained about Gurdjieff's teachings. And I'm just wondering ... I didn't understand All and Everything well enough to know how to Work from it, in other words.

Mr. Nyland: Well, if you could become practical now, what does Ouspensky teach about Work on yourself.

Questioner: To start by self-observation.

Mr. Nyland: Right. How do you understand that.

Questioner: Well, I understood it by trying to see myself during the day, not ... well, the record that plays over and over when you're resentful of people, talking too much, getting caught up in anger and ... and getting caught up reacting—things like that—and trying to see it but trying not to change it. And of course that's the problem: Always trying to change it when you can see it.

Mr. Nyland: But, how do you go about it.

Questioner: Uh, you mean just seeing it, how can I go about it.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, that's right. It's quite right.

Questioner: Yea. Just trying to remember to do it to begin with and, uh...

Mr. Nyland: No, you first have to know how to do it.

Questioner: I see. Maybe I never really learned. I'm not sure. I've read a lot, but trying to put it

into practice wasn't easy.

Mr. Nyland: When you read a lot, there is no guarantee that you will know how to Work.

Questioner: Uh-huh.

Mr. Nyland: And that of course is always the difficulty, and one keeps on reading Ouspensky and it is not clear. There are certain things in Ouspensky, of course, in In Search of the Miraculous which are quite right—I would almost say he couldn't help it—but when it really comes down to what Gurdjieff means and this is in All and Everything, it's really a question of what are we *in* that. Because it's not a question of Working on other people, or... It is a question only of Work on oneself living in conditions which, of course, affect us and where other people will affect one and one has reactions.

What does one do with such reactions. And then you must know what is really the reason that one wants to Work. It has to be, in the first place, a dissatisfaction with something that one is, and the dissatisfaction, when it can be 'changed' in the terminology of ordinary life, will not give you satisfaction that we are after. Because really when it means growing up, it means that we are very small in regard to that possible potentiality, and if we now say I would like to 'Work' as Gurdjieff indicates, I have to know first what I am before I can start. There has to be a foundation. You see, the opinion I have of myself changes and it goes on, and sometimes I can keep my mouth shut and at other times I cannot. If I'm angry, of course I'm affected. If I see certain people I don't like, immediately I have a reaction to it. But all of that is quite natural and it belongs to what I say ordinary 'Earth'—the way we live on Earth with each other—and now, do I want to go against it in some way.

I must know then the reason why I want to go against it, because otherwise it's a question of adaptation. I can learn to keep my mouth shut. I can tell myself all the time "don't react" and at certain moments maybe I'm very successful, at other times I'm sure I'm not successful; and do I gain, over a year, that kind of an insight about myself, that I can actually hold on to something that I can then use or bring to the foreground instead of my ordinary personality.

You see, Ouspensky is never clear about that...

Questioner: Hmm.

Mr. Nyland: ...and that is why it's all right—you can read from now until doomsday—but I don't think it helps. You can fill your mind with all kinds of lovely thoughts, but that's not the purpose. The purpose is growing up. How can I evolve. Rather, how can I become, on Earth,

what I will have to face when I die. If I say when I die I have 'freedom,' it definitely means the freedom from the physical body. And the assumption that life still continues to exist is a worthy assumption, because if I couldn't do that I would kill myself. If I wouldn't believe in the possibility of life after death I could, in the first place, not explain how life would be before I was born—where I even came from—and what are my characteristics where I was born on Earth; not only biological ones from father and mother and not even what you can call essentially it is if you look at astrology, but quite definitely something that has been given to me during my education, and although it may be acquired characteristics I cannot get rid of them that easily.

Now, the aim for a Man, of course, is freedom so that then, first, the freedom could be freedom from his physical body. The second aim would be: If he is free, what could then develop. Now the question that comes up constantly—what am I as I am on Earth, and have I a potentiality towards something that could grow up, and for what reason do I then want to grow up—you can say in general for the continuance of life, but if I die what will I do with my physical body. Nothing, because it isn't there so how can I prepare for any state after death. If that is freedom, how can I then furnish for life a certain let's call it a 'living quarter' or something that can contain my life, and if that happens after I die, am I sufficiently prepared when I die that that is there, or do I simply assume that God will take care of me.

I think it's a very bad situation, because I really don't know anything about what will happen after death. And I hope, of course, that I will be in luck, but in most cases I start to doubt it because my Conscience will not allow me to assume that I'm already quite ... practically perfect. And as I say, if I keep on reading about it, nothing takes place in me, than only that my mind becomes a little bit more filled with certain interesting data.

A person—each person—has a level of Being, and that is made up of what we simply consider the three centers. And in the terminology of Gurdjieff we know Bobbin-kandelnosts, if you remember, which are wound up during education and unwound when a person lives, and that in relation to the three centers a Man is incomplete. Ouspensky mentions that. He's complete as far as his body is concerned, and if the body is represented by an Octave he's up to 'Si'—not 'Do,' because the upper 'Do' would be death for the body. As far as the feeling center is concerned, it's very little developed but it is there, and there is something I call 'feeling' for myself and I know it. It's in my solar plexus; not very much in my heart, because my heart is not engaged in that as yet. I say it, but it isn't true. Feeling is simply something that, in accordance

with the same kind of a law of the Octave, only gets up to the ‘Fa’ and no further. And the intellect, it’s only at ‘Do.’

What is intellect for a Man. If it can grow out, it could become his Soul. Why his Soul. Because if he has, on Earth, any relation towards his God, he will then want to prepare in such a way that he can meet his God. His God, for him, is a higher form of Being, above him on a different level. Sometimes one says in ‘Heaven,’ but it has no meaning because we don’t know where it is. In ‘space’ we say—even that we don’t know. Free from dimensions of time—we don’t know that either. We can talk about it, but it does not mean that it is an experience. When I say even God is ‘endless,’ I have no way in my ordinary mind to conceive of that possibility. I don’t know what it is. I can say, “Endless—yes.” I can sit and think. I can think about dying, and then what. And then and then and I ... I don’t know the answer because I cannot conceive of anything continuing; because everything that I’m experiencing on this Earth has an end, and to say something is ‘endless’ is the same as saying what is the opposite of that what I now am familiar with. And then I ask myself, “What am I really familiar with that has any attributes similar to what I would ascribe to God,” and honestly I don’t know. There are really not, in any sense of the word, absolute facts for me. They are in existence. I know I am alive at this time and feel it, and I know of course I was born, I know I will die. Those, you might say, are ‘absolute’ facts, but they have no use to me. I can think about them, but they don’t help me. That I have to buy something in the store and I think about my own death, does it prepare me for not losing my temper when I have to wait too long? Of course it’s nonsense.

So the whole thing has to become much more pragmatic. Either there is, in the ideas, a possibility of an application in my life so that my life will change; or that gradually the adaptation can be understood as having an aim and that instead of the continuation of changing of certain subjectivity into another kind of subjectivity, that I finally will reach the freedom when there is a non-subjective existence. Because that I can understand: With a higher level of Being compared to the Earth, we have certain attributes in which the laws which are now on Earth are not governing me anymore, and that the possibility of freedom would go in the direction of becoming more and more free from the laws of Earth.

If you know Ouspensky, we say 48 laws. He doesn’t enumerate them, but it’s obvious there are certain laws. For instance, habit. Habits are ... is a law of them. I cannot do anything without them, because as soon as I want to bring a habit to my mind or to my knowledge it

changes, and I cannot do what I can do habitually. Habitually speaking, habitually thinking or feeling—all of that I can say it is, for me, *that* as subjectivity but I'm not free from that at all.

And all the different attributes that I now ascribe to my personality—how can I actually change them, and what direction would I want to change. Because I can put one subjectivity into another one and have a different kind of a concept, and everything will remain subjective, bound to the Earth, and the only thing I would know is when I die I would be free. But when I'm free and I'm still alive I haven't died yet, so I don't have the experience. And of course in many ways if one assumes that, I will try then to communicate with those who have died before; and we try then to make some kind of a contact, and either by clairvoyance or by conscience or by any other means that there is a possibility of understanding—extra-sensory perceptions and things of that kind—of course I would like to interpret them in a certain way, but if it is true that there is a change of level, then such spiritual existence is on a level which is not the Earth, and then I would have to bring them down to Earth and interpret them in my world. And the concepts that I get many times about so-called 'spiritual' involvement or that what is 'spiritualism,' or the concept of other spirits in other worlds still in existence, are they close enough to this world. And of course they are, but then when we receive so-called 'messages,' I interpret them in accordance with what I happen to think about.

It's very difficult even to try to continue to think. That is, if I want to think about what is Infinity, what means do I have for it. I'm afraid, you see, that I have to admit that my mind is very limited; that it has really no originality of my mind, except in a few cases when someone invents something. But even that invention is completely subjective. There is no invention as far as inner life or one's own spiritual existence is concerned.

Questioner: Uh-huh.

Mr. Nyland: You understand what I mean. This is the difficulty one faces, and it's not simply brushed away by becoming more theoretical. And when Ouspensky goes into long tirades about stepwise diagrams and Hydrogen tables and all kinds of, I would almost say 'junk,' it is of no use. Because what can I get out of that for me, in my life, when I have to live day after day. And unless this kind of religion, or concept of philosophy becomes so clear to me that I can use them during the day and not only on Sunday, there is really no use. If I am very Christian on Sunday and I forget it on Monday or Tuesday, I'm not a Christian. If I read the Bible and the Ten Commandments and all the different prescriptions that have been given in all the different

holy books, the sacred books of the East—and the Zend-Avesta and the Mahabharata—and all such—Zen Buddhism and so forth—what is it for me?

What can I do as an ordinary human being. Because, I'm not extraordinary. I'm just simple, and I want to find out what can I do with my life to give my life a color or to give my life guidance; or to have, in my life as I live it, a relationship towards that what I call 'God' or a God-like Being, or a Godhead who comes to me if it would be possible, if I am that kind of a person—actually God's child—that He would be willing even to look at me. And if I look at myself and at times of disappointment when I know what I have done I shouldn't have done it but I couldn't help it, and the conflict that takes place in a human being as he is as a personality, why would God even look at me.

Of course, in many religions we overbridge that difficulty by having a mediator. Now, when it's Christianity we say there is Jesus Christ which helps us. But, do I understand Christ. I don't think I do. That is, in general we don't. We know Jesus as a man and we know him as a Messenger from Above. I say "Yes, Buddha—also Messenger." Mohammed—of course. In All and Everything I see Ashiata Shiemash. What is their message for me to do *now*, or do I have to believe in *them* and then through them can go to God and all of the different concepts that are been connected with it. You see, I lose myself much too much in dogma and in certain doctrines, and I try to live in accordance with it because my father and mother have said, "Well, the Church told me," or some priest or somebody I admire, he told me, he said "Be honest." How can I be honest.

These are the difficulties, and Ouspensky doesn't talk about that. He just repeats a few things here and there from Gurdjieff he remembers. And all of that is important enough when you want to go into that, but what is Work. When Gurdjieff talks about Partkdolg Duty, at least he tells something. He talks about little 'I'; not the way that Ouspensky talks about so many little "I's or so many "I's of my personality: That's nothing, because that is just ordinary facets of my personality. I'm different with different people because I have to use different language sometimes—I cannot tell so-and-so the same thing as someone else because they are not interested—and of course I'm a different kind of a person before I eat lunch and when I have eaten my lunch, when I talk to my boss I'm different from when I talk to the servants, and all those "I's so-called by Ouspensky, it's just nothing else than a description of a personality.

Gurdjieff talks about little 'I', little 'I' of a certain quality, a certain something that is

‘Objective’ he says, that actually could begin to function. How do I make it. In the first place by thinking; in the second place by feeling, by wishing; in the third place by creating something that looks like it. And I say many times I ‘wish’ it was there, in exactly the same way that when I pray to God I wish He was here. I can even ask, “Why doesn’t He take me by the hand and lead me,” and I say my religion has to be a guide for me. When it is a guide then at least I would know which way to turn, but as it is now I don’t know very much about what to do, and when I have to make a decision I don’t know really if it is right or not. I say, “If I have a Conscience,” but I don’t have it. My conscience is different from someone else, and when a person says “Yes, he is working in accordance with his conscience,” well, it doesn’t go with me because my conscience happens to be a little different.

My bringing-up may be quite different from someone else, and all the differences in personalities, and all the different little bits of religion and all the different congregations, and all the differences in opinion and all the many books that have been written about religion—and about what an aborigine does, and what I do, what so-and-so does in Eskimo-land—how do I know what it is for me. I’m brought up in certain surroundings; I call it ‘civilization’—yes—and I am brought up in accordance with natural laws, and I live my natural life because my physical body belongs to the Earth so of course I’m bound by that. But what can still fly away. Perhaps my feeling, if it actually could develop; and if it is just a little feeling it doesn’t amount to much, but when it is an emotion and it goes deep and it wants to have a contact with a higher form of Being and even then I can pray for that, can I expect that to come down.

What should I do when I face this problem—as Gurdjieff says, ‘Work on yourself.’ What is meant by such words. He said ‘little ‘I’,’ but what for is it. Because if little ‘I’ is made in the image of God brought down to me I wish to create it, how do I create it. I cannot make it. I can say there is something that I call ‘Objective.’ As a faculty functioning I can say with my thought and my feeling I’ll give it the best I can, but the best that I can give is still subjective. And I talk about ‘Objective’ faculty, how can it be made Objective. What do I understand as subjectivity. And what would be Objectivity, a negation of subjectivity? It is not true. It has to have a certain level of its own as an existence away from the laws of Earth; about that I can agree, but then what is the form that it would take. Physical? No, because it’s Above—not of this Earth. Spiritual—yes, but what do I know about spirit, what do I know about any kind of spiritual body. You know, even if it crystallizes out and I see it—and I say “Yes, that is some kind of Fata

Morgana, something that happened there, plasma that all of a sudden crystallizes out”—and then I see a ghost or a poltergeist, or something of that kind.

When I want to have spiritual value, I sit quiet and I hope that my heart can tell me something about myself, maybe, or about God. When I have a wish, I'm touched by something of a higher nature. I know in life such things exist. I'm affected by aesthetics of a certain form. Beauty; nature even affects me; life in general; a baby affects me; all the different things that I rely on, and they affect me and I get attached to them, and then when they die—like a little kitten—I cry because something is leaving me and I was affected, and I wanted that to stay there.

You see, this is the problem. I want my life to stay with me, and for *that* reason I have to Work. Because I know my life will not stay with me the way I understand myself, unless—and there are two possibilities—unless something can be made that can contain my life, or that during my lifetime I can place the accent on my life and not my physical body. And that would become the key and the reason for Work; because then I say “If, now, when my physical body dies then there is spiritual existence,” how can I prepare for making mansions in Heaven.

That's what Christ said—he was going to prepare. For what and for whom, and what is it that is required of them to do. Is it that I have to go to the bridge—myself—and that perhaps God can come and help me across the bridge. Or, maybe not God; maybe a semi-God; maybe a God from the mountain Olympus; maybe just a higher little bit of a spirit; maybe my father, if he is spiritual enough to be in existence and still is, perhaps, around the Earth somewhere where I can make contact; or a thought that I, as it were, project into Infinity and wish to let it crystallize; or a concept of timelessness in which I say that could ‘free’ me from the dimensions, of course, of space and time—and all of that, when I start to talk about such things and I sit quiet and then I would like something to come into me which can give me at a certain time assurance, this kind of realization of myself that it is worthwhile to hold onto my life and to loosen up the bondage of my physical body that is the bondage of my Earth, that then I have to prepare something that doesn't exist at the present time in order to have my life continue.

I'm afraid that human beings have to Work for their Souls. I don't think the Soul exists. I think there is a possibility of Working for it, of making it. Because that's the payment that we have to give, that is exacted from us. When we say we are God's ‘children,’ we have the obligation to grow up. He never said—and it was never in the Bible—that we as human beings are full grown and then are His sons and daughters. We are still children.

In what way are we children. This is the problem. We are a child in regard to our feelings. We are a very small baby in regard to our mind. Our minds and our feelings are beautiful for the Earth and they can do a great many things, even invent even a spaceship and go to Mars; but what good does it do me, and are the people who are in the spaceship prepared to go to Mars. What is Mars. It's a planet. What is it in me: My emotions. What is the Earth: My physical body. What is the potentiality of a Consciousness: The Sun. My consciousness, what is it. It's a little bit of a brain that happens to think and by association that acquires knowledge and maybe has a good memory, but what is, as I said before, original.

Work on oneself means I want to create something I say, now, as an entity. Because, I don't know the form. I cannot see it. It is like a person ... although I can say that it will have to grow, I can say it is similar to a feeling which goes very deep and then becomes emotional—like maybe in prayer I have a relationship towards something that I have never seen, I have belief in that what I haven't seen—at the same time I dare to say God exists because I 'feel' Him. That what I want to create is something of a similar nature. I say in the eyes of the world it doesn't exist as such, in the eyes of God I want that to exist as something coming from Him. And, what can I ask Him for. I say I create, if I can, an 'entity'; that is, in imagination I project it somehow or other, I say it has to have a form of some kind, it also has to function. It has to be part of me. It has to be in such a way that it could develop within me, because I have no right and I have absolutely no ... no way of ordering the atmosphere of my life—I cannot project anything outside of me and still have it under my control.

So this little 'I', I start to think what should this little 'I' be. I'm interested in Consciousness, I say it should be a little bit of Consciousness. I'm interested in Conscience, I say it should be a little bit of Conscience. It should be something that still has a potentiality of growth, and it should be linked up with something of me that can grow out also in connection with that what I could project as a development for myself. And what I ... what do I mean, again, by 'self.' My reality. That what I am actually. Not the personality—that is surface. Not my essentiality; it's a little bit deeper, not deep enough. What is for me my reality, of myself the real Self. It's Magnetic Center. Gurdjieff calls it that way. It is the center of my life within me. It is the place where my life has its point of gravity, and I wish this life that is now encased in this physical body to be free from the body in order to meet the conditions of my death. And I want to do that while I'm still alive and, you might say, in my 'good senses,' and not waiting until I

die and then have to take whatever comes. Because a human being who's serious is not satisfied with such assumptions. He has to have belief in a possibility of actualizing something that at the present time in his life can give him satisfaction.

What is the satisfaction he wants. Gurdjieff calls it 'harmonious.' It is a Harmonious Man. It means, really, a balance. It means a balance, within myself, of the three different items, the three different parts of my personality. And we can call them 'centers.' They are not centers—it is the wrong word—but in any event it indicates a little bit of a separation between that what is intellect, and what is feeling and what is emotional, and what is physical, and there should be a balance.

So I look at myself, is there a balance between my physical center and my mind. That is, does my mind know what my physical center wants, and does my physical center admit that there is a mind that it ought to follow. Of course I have no use for my mind when it comes to my physical body. I cannot say to my mind, "Tell my physical body not to be hungry." My mind has absolutely nothing to do with my physical body when it is sleeping, and all the different things that belong to my physical body, my mind has absolutely no ... nothing to say about it. My mind as it is now is such a little bit of a child, and regarding my physical body it is negative. Because my body predominates; 90 percent of it; feeling—6 percent, maybe 7; intellect—3, perhaps even less. And that's me, and I call that balanced?

Balanced, for a Harmonious Man, is a development of all three centers to receive, for each center, equal value dependent on the level where each center needs to live. Now, it's different for intellect to be compared with feelings and to be compared with physical body because they don't vibrate in the same way, but there is a possibility of an equilibrium, that the substance is full-grown to what we call, in a Gurdjieffian sense, a full-grown 'body' so that, comparing it to a little scale of an Octave, that the three Octaves actually could exist together. And what is then the requirement. In the first place, that there is no disputing, no argument between the three bodies, like there is constantly an argument between any one of my senses and the others. And the best example, of course, is that I say my mind 'wants' something my feeling says "No" or reversely—my feeling says "Yes" my mind says "No." And what will follow: What I really like, and many times that feeling is so closely connected to my physical body that the physical body usually wins out.

When my mind wants to talk, only sometimes it has such an originality of thought that in

the presence of that even my feeling shuts up and my physical body stands in awe. But it doesn't happen often. There is not that clarity of my mind. The mind has to develop, and surely it is so far removed from a Soul. A Soul would be that what is intellectual body, fully developed, in its own Octave.

Tape person: It's time.

Mr. Nyland: Already?

Person: Yes.

side 2 Mr. Nyland: You see now how it goes. There is a little question, and I spend the time now trying to answer the question and at the same time getting a little bit more perspective, and of course it goes over into something like a lecture. And maybe you don't want it that way. But you see, you don't have enough questions. I'm quite convinced that even if you have read, you don't know what you want to talk about. Because you have no idea what is Work unless you have Worked, or unless someone has told you what Work is, you may have made an attempt.

Work is very difficult. Work is not just something that you take off a tree as fruit. Work is not something that you just wish for and there it is, overnight. Work is a lifetime. Work means that you are interested and remain interested. Work means that you create something that could help you that has qualities and attributes which belong to a different kind of a level of world belonging to, I say, 'God.' It doesn't matter, you can put God just almost a little bit above you because when you get there you will change it into another kind of a God which is higher. Mountain Olympus and all the different Norse gods that you might know about, the mythology Norwegian, Scandinavian—all of that is predicated on differences of levels. Demi-gods and semi-gods and then the high god—Greek mythology—there is a whole chaos that is the Gods. In the Testament there are different kinds of Gods—Jehovah, Yahweh, God, Elohim. All of that are differences in interpretations and concepts, so it does not matter if, for oneself, I say that what is the highest for me is something that is not subjective and not made by me but, as it were, by God.

How can I say that. Because, what is there that I actually wish. If I could have this kind of an understanding—that if I create something to the best of my knowledge, that God would acknowledge it—I would almost say the only way by which a prayer can be heard is when there is a unity in a Man, when all his centers—his three centers—unite into one aim only. Even if the centers are not fully developed, that there is no *arrière-pensée*, that there is not something that is

still to be considered at the back door, that I enter through the front door openly and, like a Man, walk upright and standing straight and then say, "Here I am."

And God asks me "What are you," and what can I tell Him. That I'm stupid? That I'm ignorant about this and that? That I really don't know? That there is constantly civil war going on within myself, and my personality is very seldom at ease with itself? That it always has to have something from the outside world that will start to help me, so that I believe in my friends and I want to ask them and talk with them? That I cannot sit quietly for an hour without having all kinds of other thoughts enter into my head? That I cannot even stand still for five minutes without moving. There is no control, I would say, whatsoever; because all I do is reacting to the outside world, and the reactions are not my own.

So for that reason if I create a little 'I' I can say it could be my own, but how little there is that I can create. Not even knowing the form; and I say it's an 'entity' and I use the word 'faculty'—Objective faculty—I say 'little 'I',' I get away with it because I don't define it further, but I can define it by means of what it should do. That's important. It doesn't matter at all—perhaps even that it doesn't exist—as long as I can believe in the possibility of the existence; and that then that existence tells me to do certain things in which I further believe until I can justify the time and the energies spent in following up certain commandments which then are verified by my own experience. And this is the quintessence of Work. It does not matter very much what Gurdjieff tells you, and it does not matter so much what you read in All and Everything. The only thing that matters is what you are, what your experience and what your life tells you that is the truth.

If there is doubt about the truth, you must find out why such doubt. The truth is an untruth as long as there is conflict. The truth becomes total truth when there is a realization of unity of the totality of a personality; when the three centers could become One, and the truth becomes full truth when all three centers have grown out to become full-grown bodies. And this is what we talk about: A higher Being-body for which energy has to be given in the best way one can, and usually taken from energy that is now available to the physical body, because that's the highest form of energy that we are acquainted with.

So what is, now, Work: The creation of little 'I' and make this little 'I' function so that that what then is Conscious and Conscientious is united, in this little 'I', as functioning in a certain way. We call it 'Observing me.' Observe me? Why. Why me. Because it's my 'I'. It belongs

to me, and I expect this 'I' to help me and to guide me. I expect this little 'I' to remind me of my aim, my aim for freedom. I want this little 'I', in Observing, to be what it is, and I want to find out what it is because I myself, as I am unconscious, really don't know.

One of the reasons for freedom, for oneself why it is so difficult, is identification with myself. You see, I cannot help that because my feeling is already identified with my physical body. I have no particular way of talking the language of my feeling, let alone my emotions. It is so closely connected with the physical center that the feeling has no language of its own, and has to borrow the physical center for an expression. And that is what makes it so difficult for me—to separate the two, if that is necessary, to become two separate bodies when already in an unconscious state I'm incapable of such separation; and I can only hope for it, and perhaps I have to be patient to go through a rather long period of trying to do certain things that seem impossible.

With the mind it's probably also pretty bad, because my mind is made up of associations. And I cannot help that either, because that's the way I have been brought up. I have been taught that way. I have received knowledge to be stored away. I have received good marks for having a good memory. I always would, say, 'put in front of the class' when I was clever. I got away with many things—partly by strength, partly by being really clever and to assert myself that way—and to have admiration because such a mind, then, is looked upon by someone else with jealousy. It's all the time this question of the associations—the relationship of that what happened with that what has already happened—so that then I'm very clever when I remember the name ... and even can give you the history of how I originally saw a person by such-and-such a name, and here you are and I associate you with that person but you don't look alike.

What is it that the mind does for us: To be able to walk on the street; to be able to read books; to be able to so-called 'think' and to delve into the secrets of nature—also to harness nature in a certain way until nature gets sick and tired of it. And then there is an earthquake, and where is Man. He dies. When Mother Nature doesn't want it anymore, then I think that humanity has to watch out very much. Because individually and as persons, we cannot do very much. United as Mankind, we really have not much to say about Mother Nature. And you know it: One little thunderstorm with lightning, and you're struck dead.

So we cannot really find an answer that way, and we have to see if this little 'I' can actually become a certain kind of a master, if you wish. But not in the beginning, because I will not

acknowledge it. I have too many things that I am educated with that give me, at a certain time, very definitely knowledge, and I want to assert myself and I have self-love, I want to be conceited, I want to be admired and respected because, I say, I'm 'entitled' to it. Even I say I'm entitled to the talent which Mother Nature has given me—or God or whom—but in any event I find myself with it, and then when I start to develop a little, I think it's to my credit. Always the time comes that I say, "Look at me. You see, I've done this and done that"—particularly when I become father or when I am an older man, or so, and someone comes for advice and I say, "My boy, you ought to do the way *I* have done. You see, in my time at least you were this and that." And then the poor fellow goes home and says, "My father is much too conservative for me, he doesn't understand me" and he rebels. That's quite right.

What is it that I want to do with this little 'I'. I want this little 'I' to grow up to become help ... of help, a guide. It has to have a quality not of this Earth. I want something out of this ... away from this Earth, from Heaven. I want this little 'I' to be Heaven on Earth, and now I wish to Work and I bring this Heaven within me. The understanding of Heaven is one of endlessness, is one of freedom from associations, is one of freedom from partiality. And so I say in the 'image' of that I wish this little 'I' to function, and I give it, as it were, a 'task' to Observe me, and meaning by Observation to record my existence. Only my existence: That I Am; that I am alive; that I am on this Earth; not an aliveness, but going further than the aliveness into what we now call 'Awareness,' which means that the Observation becomes so pure—almost intellectually so cold—that it does nothing else but recording the existence of my life as it is and the acceptance of the form in which this life happens to be; which means, again, that regardless of whatever the manifestations may be of myself, that little 'I' will accept me, like God accepts sinners as well as those who walk in the rain or in the sunshine.

This is the quality of this little 'I': In the first place to be Impartial; and to be free from the associations of my mind. What is that. The associations of my mind are dependent on what is coming to me from the future and what is going away from me as the past. That is where I think, and about that I think. I do not think about the present, because there is nothing in my mind that will be able to register the present.

[Aside: Mr. Nyland: Don't do that. I don't like that. Please stop it. Can't you hear it?

Person 1: It's just... Mr. Nyland: Yah. What is this. Person 1: I'd like to record you for some friends. Mr. Nyland: Yeah I know it, I have seen that. But, what is this whispering.

Person 1: I don't know. Mr. Nyland: What is it you want. Person 2: I wanted to try to

explain it. Mr. Nyland: Why should you! I can tell him. Person 2: mmph. Mr. Nyland: It's quite all right as long as you don't tell him. [laughter]]

My mind is incapable even of knowing about the present. You see, time goes for us quite fast. It is in the future as anticipation. Time is like a flow of some form of energy which is recorded in me as time. I cannot measure it, than only by means of certain things I call a watch or the Sun traveling around ... or the Earth traveling around the Sun. But, I have no instrument ... and I have related them to a simple one like a watch like I relate measurements in space to a yardstick, but when it comes to the realization of myself that a moment of time is there, I call it always a 'second' or something of a very short duration. Freedom from time means freedom from the duration of time, freedom even from a point. Because a point, either in space or in time, has still potentiality, but a moment has no potentiality in the way I now am associating it with as far as time and seconds are concerned. A moment is that what is without dimension, without time, with a possibility of an expanding into Infinity—which again is timeless, and no dimensional space or time either. And now when I say the current of time coming towards me from the future and leaving me and becoming my past—and which I of course, recall in memory and then my memory is used for—what is the moment when it actually is there for me, at that moment, going through me, in which moment there is no thought but there is an Awareness of my existence. This is the definition of the moment.

And so I endow this little 'I' with these attributes, because I say those attributes come as close as I can think about them to the concept of 'Omni', which I ascribe to God. Omnipresent, Omniscient, Omnipotent. 'Omni' is a very interesting word. It is really an Amness, but it is the 'Om' which changes to am and the 'ni' changes to I. Then it becomes a statement for myself at the present moment—or a moment in the present—"I Am." And this becomes very important also in Work: That I understand this "I-Am"ness of myself as I am, and the acceptance of myself as I am in my manifestations, and that the emphasis is on the aliveness of myself as I am in this form.

What is it that I wish this 'I' to do: To become Aware of me existing. I want to have facts about myself which are truthful. No interpretation, no liking or disliking, no associations at all. Just a fact; then it is the truth because I know that *that* truth will make me free. And when I now can accumulate such facts they become, for me, my experience. And the verification of that what Gurdjieff says is only proven by my experience, that when I know, if possible with the

totality of myself that that is so and not different—no question of argument, no question again and again of the liking or disliking but acceptance as it is—then I see that in the realization of this kind of a method put into practice—the Observation of little ‘I’ of that what exists which is my body and I must say ‘Impartially’ and I say ‘Simultaneously’ with that what takes place at the moment, registered at that moment and not later—I eliminate thoughts and I eliminate feelings, and I substitute in their place an Awareness, and an Awareness continued on the part of the little ‘I’ would become an Awakening.

And then I say that is the ‘crux’ of the matter; because when there is an Awakened ‘I’, that what I am now as this what I call ‘It’—my body, my personality with all the different functions—is unconscious and I say it is ‘half-asleep.’ Because it is not the physical sleep—‘It’ wakes up from that—but what is the next step: To become Awake. But, what becomes Awake. The little ‘I’ first ... or what is Aware: The little ‘I’ at one moment, hoping that the effort I make for the creation and asking this little ‘I’ to become Aware of me, that then it might be continued if I continue to make the effort.

And then I must say that when I make an effort to try to create it, that also when I don’t make the effort there is no little ‘I’ and don’t talk about little ‘I’ existing or ‘I’ existing. Don’t talk about higher Being-bodies existing; you can’t do anything with them; even if they did exist and you’re not Conscious of them, they have no existence for you. So don’t quibble about such terms. You’ve got to undo your ignorance. If the ignorance means that you don’t know it exists but you have to undo it in some way or other, you may as well call it ‘Work’; it comes to the same thing as creating something that doesn’t exist and in the creation perhaps could continue to exist.

You understand Work. You understand what, perhaps, is meant. What does this little ‘I’ Observe, and can Observe. It cannot Observe your feelings, because the requirement is Impartiality and your feeling is totally partial. Don’t think for a moment that the little ‘I’, in its infancy, is capable of Impartiality, particularly when the object of Observation is your feeling—your feeling center, your solar plexus. Neither is the little ‘I’ capable of Observing your intellect. Your thoughts when the whole process is anti-associative, it cannot be done. And don’t fool yourself. The little ‘I’ is, at certain times and in its infancy when it is very small, maybe not more than one or two cells that you can create, and not more than one or two cells which can be filled by life from God—because that’s what you pray for when you want to

develop yourself—that then because of this, this process of Observation has to be made extremely simple.

For many reasons it is difficult. Because this little 'I' which can be created, even if it is imagination in the beginning, is in your head and it is surrounded by all kind of other thought processes. It is a mental process of Awareness, but it is quite different from thinking. As a matter of fact, it is anti-thinking like it is anti-feeling. That is the first reason. The second is the non-ability to Observe either your feeling or your intellect as it now functions. The third difficulty is that there is not enough energy even for the wish to create little 'I', and that most of your energy goes into ordinary life. Satisfaction of your physical body or whatever you have to do in ordinary life, it requires probably 95 percent; and 5 percent at a certain moment is available and when that's gone it's gone and your attempt to create little 'I' is gone; and it has gone over into thought process that you wanted to continue, and you are already back again in the realm of your personality. And in the fourth place, you cannot do it during the day if you wished, even, continuously; because each person who is honest will know when he makes an attempt to create little 'I' and for one moment there may be a flash of that kind of a recognition of an Objectivity, it's gone after that one moment and you cannot sustain it. And you can try it and you can think and you can create it again if you can, and again it loses its existence—it ... you might say it 'flies away,' it's not available—and in its place you become ordinary and you think again. I make an attempt at a certain time; I create it, I know it must be there because there is sometimes a realization of that kind I call 'Objectivity' of myself, and then... It is a strange process: I don't know when I lose it, but all of a sudden I discover I have lost it. I don't know when. It is not the same as the creation; that's an act of my wish, but when I lose it, it's an act of my nature and I have no control and it goes and I realize I'm 'asleep' as it were, or I'm unconscious. And the thought again strikes me—why don't you Work—and then of course I will make an attempt, I can Work at that moment again. The moment I cannot extend. I cannot continue to be Aware. I cannot honestly say that the little 'I' continues to exist, really; not for longer than half a second in our time—a moment, maybe a tenth. Sometimes a realization of such freedom that you say it is 'unknown' to me and it becomes, for me, an experience which I never will forget.

But of course we know that, but so seldom, and in the beginning don't be disheartened when you have so many failures, and don't try to substitute it by reading or by just wallowing a little bit in interpretations, let's say à la Nicoll. It's quite wrong. He didn't know enough. He

just forgot, and he wrote five volumes—published after his death, most of it—and it is not worth it, not worth the reading. Because you are constantly not reminded of Objective life. You're reminded of your ordinary life, to try to do the best you can and to try to put it on a nice little kind of a basis of ordinary conversations—of course tinted very nicely spiritually—and Nicoll was himself a very honest, earnest man, but as far as the interpretation, so-called ‘fragments’ or whatever it is—commentaries, both Ouspensky and Gurdjieff—it has no particular value. I want to say that because that’s my honest opinion. I happen to know about it. I’ve been in this kind of Work many, many years and I know a little bit about what has happened and how, at the time when Nicoll wanted to publish it, he had to ask a few friends here in America to put enough money together to help him to publish it. That was the story in the beginning ... and in the beginning he didn’t really dare or want to publish, and those who followed him as his groups, they put it together afterwards, after he died, and it is not worth it. Don’t spend any money on it.

Read All and Everything. It is a Bible. Also a Bible you can throw away after a little while; when it has been transferred to yourself; when you, in your life, will remember to remember yourself, that certain things in life can remind you to remember one’s Self. What is it—remembering. Your Self. Capital ‘S’: How you were when you were very young; unspoiled, like a child; not influenced as yet by culture or education or *bon ton* or *frou-frou* or all the rest of education that we now unfortunately have to swallow, but still pure. In its infancy so pure that you don’t remember very much, that was your Self. And remember *that*; not the way you are: it’s a small ‘s,’ that’s yourself, that’s your personality only, and you forget many times your inner life, you don’t know the levels anymore, all you do know is a little bit of seriousness.

And of course it is useful, it is necessary. What is this Man Number Four à la Ouspensky: A person who happens to wish for certain things that are impossible for him, who believes in the possibility but does not know entirely what to do about it. A person who wishes to change his solar plexus into the functioning of his heart to become the center of a Kesdjanian body so that then there is a place for a spiritual life existing and his inner life being able to continue, after his death, as a stepping stone towards the formation of his Soul. That is the progress, and that is the problem: How can I create that, how can I go. I said a little while ago, if I am at the bridge that God could come and help me. What is this bridge. We call it the ‘Fa’-bridge—one-and-a-half notes of the Octave, where I am at ‘Mi’ after ‘Do-Re-Mi.’ ‘Do-Re-Mi’ is Man Number Four, which means I’m interested in life, interested in Work on myself if I could understand it,

interested in evolution, interested in freedom, interested in making something of my life because I know that my life on Earth is not worth very much. And really, what I want many times is not worthwhile even to spending the energy on. What good does it do to me to have ten, fifteen thousand dollars in the bank. I want to spend it. What good does it do to me to have a lovely brain? I want to talk, what good does it do to me when I have artistic feeling. I want to create some pieces of art, but what good does it do to me. When I'm honest and serious and wanting the truth, that gives me the relation towards a higher form of Being and that might enable me to become free from the Earth.

How will I say it. You have to read, of course, to know a little bit. You have to get together, you have to talk. I look at you as the possibility of a Group. Half of you will disappear because you won't be interested. I doubt it very much if you really can keep up an interest in these kind of ephemeral pieces of knowledge, which ought to lead to understanding for anyone who is serious about himself. Because sooner or later you will have to face that problem. You will not be able to get away from it. You will face it. You don't think much about your death. You don't have to think very much about it when you grow older—that is not an indication that then you should start to think about your death. You die a thousand deaths a day. You kill, many times, yourself. You kill life in you. You don't really adhere to the continuation of life as it ought to be in you. I say you 'kill' it, because you don't pay attention to your life. You don't take care of it. You misuse it. You misuse your three centers. You fill your mind with all kind of nonsense. You gossip and you 'feel' so-called, and you talk, talk, talk with your feelings about all kinds of unnecessary things. As far as your physical body is concerned, you know very well what happens with your body when you want this and that and the other.

In your life, are you simple? Can you live on bread and water? Can you live with five books? Can you really stay alive enough and continue to think about holy script, or are you taken up too much by ordinary existence for reasons of economy—that you have to make a living. How much do you spend, then, on that—to maintain it. How much do you spend of your energy for the continuation of your physical body. How often do you give in to it. How do you spend your time, which is yours, that you honestly can say at the end of a day "I've spent my minutes the way I wanted to," or do you want to be honest and say, "How much did I lose." Are you responsible for your energy. Has God given you responsibility for that, or do you think it's Mother Nature that will care of it in time. Mother Nature leaves you when you die. What will

you do after that. Refer to it? Talk about your past? Do you think that the spirits are interested in your life on Earth?

Try to link all of this up with Work on yourself to establish for yourself a solidity within; an equilibrium between three centers, if possible to make them grow out to become full grown and then, of course, creating a balance. And then, what is the aim of three bodies: To become One. Because the three bodies are a symbol of the tri-unity. What is God as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. What is in Man as his three full-grown bodies. What are the functions, and then what is the wish for unity, to become One. But not a fourth body. You see, that's where Ouspensky makes a mistake. The three bodies become One, but it is an entity entirely different from any of the bodies as component parts. When you know chemistry, you know that there are certain reactions in which different chemicals are joined together, they form a new chemical of an entirely different kind of property than the component parts. H_2O does not have the properties of hydrogen or oxygen. It is, you can change it, you can synthesize it, you can analyze it, you can bring it back again to the components and you can bring ... from the components bring it up again to that what is the entity.

This is the idea for Man when he wishes to become self-Conscious. The self-Consciousness belongs to Man himself as he is on Earth. The next realm would be his Cosmic Consciousness, in which a Man learns to give up himself and to understand life as it is, totally, without any kind of form. The third realm is universal Consciousness and Conscience, in which Man learns to understand the totality of the universe and then would, perhaps, be capable of helping His Endlessness as God the Almighty Father, Omnipresent and all that exists endlessly to help to maintain the levels of life on Earth as well as on the planets, as well as on our Sun and the little Solar System of ours, or that what are different Solar Systems or what may be even one Milky Way and several Milky Ways until finally God the Sun Absolute, Infinity total—plus Infinity, negative Infinity, totality—the realization of that what is is now and that what never will be cannot be now, because all that is, is now, and Man has to learn to understand the Infinity within himself.

So we will stop then. How will you be. Come together each week. Read a little and talk. But practice ... put to practice the few things I've said. If you do not know and if I was not enough clear for you, I will send you some tapes if you want to listen to them. Take them in. Listen to them. Don't talk too much about it, than only if it gives you the value of the ability to

wish to Work—what to do—and talk about that then, about your attempts. That is important. Otherwise you will not grow; and your mind will stay exactly the same and you will run up against the wall, you will not be able to understand not even All and Everything when you read it perhaps even for the third time.

The road is long, but it is interesting because it can give you, already in such attempts, equilibrium, relaxation, insight, Aspiration, Inspiration, finally it will give you Silence for yourself based on the solidarity within and the possibility of the growth of your inner life to becoming that what you should become as a Man being born on Earth and now unconscious, gradually loosening the bondage of the Earth to become a real Man—harmonious—that is in that kind of balance producing a universal sound of an entity which is absolute.

Maybe I see you again sometime. Come to New York if you can, if you wish. But, Work first. We will take care of any tapes you send here, we'll listen, we'll try to give you answers. You must Work. There are several Groups in the United States at the present time—Gurdjieff Groups, I mean; actually Gurdjieff Groups where there is talk about Work on oneself and not what I many times call 'prattle' and a little bit of a substitute. It is sinful to use the name of Gurdjieff in vain.

So goodnight, everybody. I hope to see you again, sometime.

Person: Is there a glossary that we can use in connection with reading All and Everything.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, we have an Index.

Person: Where is it possible to get it.

Mr. Nyland: [chuckle] All right?

End of tape